

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 989

HE 014 597

AUTHOR Barger, Robert N.; Barger, Josephine C.
 TITLE The Two Edges of Advisement: Report of a National Survey.
 PUB DATE Oct 81
 NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Academic Advising Association (5th, Indianapolis, IN, October 11-14, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Decision Making; Faculty Advisers; Higher Education; Majors (Students); National Surveys; *Participant Satisfaction; Private Colleges; School Size; State Colleges; *Student Attitudes; Trend Analysis; *Undergraduate Students

ABSTRACT

The state of academic advisement in postsecondary education was studied through a survey of representatives of 58 colleges and universities and students who were pursuing undergraduate degrees in four-year institutions during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. About 59 percent of the institutions were public, 41 percent were private, and 22 percent had a central advisement program. Only 45 percent of the public students rated their advisement as excellent-to-good, compared to almost 59 percent of the private students. For the three time periods, there was a marked decrease in public student satisfaction with their advisement and a corresponding increase in private student satisfaction. Students in large public universities were considerably less happy with their advisement than were students in small schools. Students viewed themselves as the most helpful resource in making decisions about majors, teachers as the most helpful external resource, and advisors tied with friends as being least helpful. Some of the data indicate that 34 percent of the freshmen were not obliged to consult an advisor. In addition to the survey findings, 20 issues that have affected postsecondary education over the last two decades are briefly considered. These include an emphasis on science, civil rights, affirmative action, women's rights, a movement that emphasized ethnic identity, community colleges, student power, financial aid from governmental sources, adult and continuing education, and Public Law 94-142. A bibliography, sample questionnaires, and sample student descriptions of an ideal student advisement program are appended. (SW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED210989

THE TWO EDGES OF ADVISEMENT
Report of a National Survey

by

Robert N. & Josephine C. Barger
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert N. & Josephine C. Barger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of
the National Academic Advising Association
Indianapolis, Indiana
October 11 - 14, 1981

HE 014597

Introduction to the Survey

This study provides information and opinions concerning the state of academic advisement in postsecondary education. The data were drawn from a small national sample of students who were pursuing undergraduate degrees in four-year institutions during the 1960's, the 1970's and the 1980's and from the institutions which these students attended (students n=122; institutions n=58).

The study was named "The Two Edges of Advisement" because questions were asked, first, of students and then of representatives of the institutions which these student respondents attended. Copies of the questionnaires which were used are appended to this study. Selected student subjective comments related to academic advisement appear on pages following the student questionnaire at the end of this study.

The way in which the students were selected for this study was a bit unique in that it began with my (Jo Barger) contacting my own nieces and nephews who have attended, or are presently attending, college. These number approximately fifty-six. The sample was then enlarged to include relatives and friends of my co-workers in the Academic Advisement Center at Eastern Illinois University. This was done with an attempt to control for such variables as race, sex, geographic distribution, and institutional size, type and public or private affiliation. A list of institutions which responded is appended to this study.

The data were computer-processed using the crosstabulation subprogram of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The sample size was so small, although diverse, that it cannot be claimed that the results are widely representative. We do think that the results make for some interesting reflection, however.

Before we analyze our statistical tables, Bob Barger will provide a broad background for the study by discussing some issues that have affected trends in postsecondary education in recent times.

ISSUES AFFECTING TRENDS IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

I am going to make a brief comment on each of twenty issues that I see as affecting trends in postsecondary education over the last couple of decades. The list that I am going to cover is not an exclusive one. There are obviously a great many more than twenty issues that have affected postsecondary education. The twenty that I have selected are simply some of the more visible issues from the social and educational areas that I believe have had, or will have, a readily identifiable impact on the postsecondary scene. I encourage you, during the discussion period, to add issues to this list which you think are important, especially from the viewpoint of academic advisement, or to question ones that I have mentioned which seem redundant to you or which you believe should be omitted on some grounds. The ordering that I will follow is not a rank ordering. Rather, the issues will be arranged, for the most part, in a chronological pattern.

SCIENCE EMPHASIS

This emphasis began with the launching of Sputnik in 1957. Sputnik seemed to signal a Russian technological superiority. The United States wanted to catch up with Russia by encouraging more concentration in mathematics and the sciences at all levels of education. The federal government lent a hand to this encouragement by making money available for research and special programs, especially at the postsecondary level.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Brown vs. Board of Education decision of 1954 was the first shot in what was to be a long battle for civil rights in this century.

When Autherine Lucy registered two years later as the first Black student at the University of Alabama, an angry crowd drove her from the campus. Today, a quarter of a century later, Black students are finally attending college in the same proportion to their presence in the population as White students.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Federal regulations requiring affirmative action in employment first became applicable to postsecondary education in 1971. These regulations have put pressure on postsecondary institutions to obtain more representative numbers of minorities and women on their staffs.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The Women's Rights movement was heralded by Betty Friedan's 1963 book The Feminine Mystique. The movement had impact not only on employment, but it also led to an increase in the numbers of women attending college, as well as to the establishment of women's studies as an academically respectable interdisciplinary area.

ETHNICITY

This movement, which developed in parallel with the Black and Women's movements, emphasized ethnic identity. Like these movements, it has affected postsecondary education primarily in the areas of employment, recruitment and area studies.

BIRTH CONTROL

"The Pill," developed in the 1950s, has played a large role in limiting population. We are seeing its effect in the demographic wave of reduction that has swept across the lower levels of the educational ladder and is now hitting the postsecondary rung.

COLLEGE EXPECTANCY

Not many years ago, it was expected that most people would have a high school diploma as a preparation for the job market. Now that expectation has been superseded by the expectation of at least some college, if not a college diploma, before seeking employment.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

As a corollary of college expectancy, a new level of schooling has developed with the formation of state systems of two-year colleges in the 1960s. These institutions were intended to service both terminal and transfer students within commuting distance of their homes.

STUDENT POWER

The last two decades have seen a dramatic increase in the amount of student participation in the determination of decisions affecting postsecondary education. This increased participation was catalyzed by the Free Speech movement, the Viet Nam War protests and other forms of student activism associated with the '60s.

DRUGS

Drugs have had a double effect on postsecondary education. They have diluted the quality of the postsecondary experience for many of their users. And they have been at least partially responsible for many of their users dropping out of college.

FINANCIAL AID

Financial Aid from governmental sources became available to students in the late 1950s. It is safe to say that without it we would not see the high rates of postsecondary enrollment that we have seen to date.

ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

This heading covers two somewhat different movements. The first is directed to the increased servicing of older undergraduates who do not match the 18-21 undergraduate age expectation. The second is directed to in-service or public service efforts for those who are, for the most part, not degree candidates.

HEALTH CONSCIOUSNESS

President John F. Kennedy was probably responsible for promoting this consciousness on a national scale. It seems to have influenced the increase of programs and enrollment in such fields as Health, Physical Education and Recreation. At the very least, it is responsible for the large number of joggers on college campuses!

PUBLIC LAW 94-142

This federal law, only recently put into effect, guarantees a free and appropriate public education for every handicapped person aged 3 to 21. One of its eventual effects would seem to be an increase in the number of handicapped people who will be going on for postsecondary education.

SECTION 504

This section of a 1973 law which has recently taken full effect will insure physical environment accessibility and program accessibility for handicapped postsecondary students. This should also make for increased numbers of handicapped students on campus.

COMPUTERS

The computer plays three roles in postsecondary education: it is a teaching tool which I think will more and more be recognized as unparalleled

in the history of education, it is a management tool which makes possible large-scale institutional operation, and it is also providing new and enlarged fields of study for students.

BACK TO BASICS

This is a movement which has so far mainly affected the elementary and secondary levels. I believe, however, that it is beginning to affect curricular decisions at the postsecondary level.

MATERIALISM

Somewhere between the '60s and the '80s a more materially oriented mood seems to have gained ascendancy in this country. This has led to an increased salary consciousness on the part of students and a consequent increase in their choice of majors, such as Business, which will yield high financial returns.

MBO

The management process known as management-by-objective is more and more being employed in the management of postsecondary institutions. I think that this is indicative of the fact that postsecondary presidents think of themselves as the chief manager of the institution rather than its chief teacher. It is now necessary to add that, in days gone by, the reverse used to be the case.

CONSERVATISM

This last issue hardly needs comment, except to point out that it is exemplified both in students' attitudes and in diminished levels of funding for postsecondary education.

CONCLUSION

I am not going to attempt to evaluate how much each of the above-mentioned issues has affected postsecondary education. I suggest that their impact has been more linear than discrete, and hence that it is

not very well suited to quantitative measurement.

I leave you to draw your own conclusions about the causal relationships between the issues that I have just described and the results of the survey which you are about to see. I invite you to share your opinions about these relationships in the discussion period.

ANALYSIS OF STATISTICAL TABLES

(The following comments are numbered according to the tables to which they refer.)

1. We divided our 122 students into 3 groups. The reason we chose 3 groups was for ease in analysis. You can see that the smallest number of students in our study were in school in the early 60's with very few in the 50's.

The two larger groups were in the period shown here.

2. In the time units completed we are showing how long these students went to school. Note percentages 9% 16% 64% 1% 10%
3. This shows the gradual movement of students from being advised by a professional advisor to being advised by a Departmental advisor. Note that the decrease begins in the sophomore year but the big decrease comes in the junior and senior years. In the second row the increase, naturally, is shown.
4. I think the first and last percentages on this sheet are interesting. The first indicates that, apparently, 34% of the freshmen were not obliged to consult an advisor. But 45% of the seniors were still being required to see an advisor.
5. The interesting findings about who helped students decide their majors were that the students themselves were seen as their own most helpful resource in making a decision. Teachers were the most helpful external resource. While advisors tied with friends as being least helpful.
6. Here is a simple summary of how students rated their advisement. We will break this down for you shortly.

7. Here are the raw numbers concerning institutions in the survey.
Translated to percentages, about 59% were public institutions and 41% were private. About 38% of all the institutions had central advisement. Of those that did, slightly more than half were public and slightly less than half were private.
8. Of the 22 institutions that had central advisement, 38% had a staff of 1 to 3 people; 24% had a staff of 4 to 6, 10% had a staff of 7 to 10, and 29% had more than 10 on their staff.
9. Of all institutions we surveyed, only 21% had evaluations procedures and, of these, the evaluation procedures went from a one person evaluation, namely, the Executive vice-president making the annual evaluation, to a student-faculty evaluation of advisers procedure.
10. Some explanation of notation is necessary for this and the following tables:
In each square the top number is the count, or raw score. The second number is the percent of that box in the context of the row across. The third number is the percent of that box in the context of the column down. The fourth number is the percent of that box in the context of all the boxes (that is, both rows and columns).
This table shows students' ratings of their advisement (abbrev. at top) as either Excellent-to-Good (abbrev.) or Fair-to-Poor (abbrev.).
The break-down of these ratings is according to the years when the students left college. Although the overall percent was a 50-50 split, a difference can be seen over the time periods. Before '68 the split of ratings was 60-40, from '68 to '75 it was 52-48, from '76 to '81 it was 42-58. Obviously, over the years people are becoming more critical of their advisement.

11. Here we see a breakdown of students attending public or private institutions according to time periods. There is a trend in the sample away from private and to public institutions.
12. Here we see the rating of students' advisement according to whether they were in public or private institutions. As you can see, the private students were happier with their advisement than were the public students. Only 45% of the public students rated their advisement as excellent-to-Good, while almost 59% of the private students did so.
- 13,14,15. On the next three tables we ran the same comparison that you just saw, but controlled for each of the three time periods. There is a clear trend running thru the three periods. As we proceed from early to late, we see a marked decrease in public student satisfaction with their advisement and a corresponding increase in private student satisfaction.
16. We wondered if the size of the institution had any effect on the advisement ratings, so we ran the ratings against the type of institution the student attended. A "multi - versity" was one with an enrollment of more than 20,000. Numbers 2 and 3 show public and private universities and colleges under 20,000. As you can see, the students in large multi - versities (all of which were public) were considerably less happy with their advisement than were students in smaller schools.
17. This shows advisement ratings according to whether the students attended institutions with, or without, central advisement. The results show a bit more satisfaction with central advisement.
- 18 - 21. In our last series of tables, we will show you the majors of students in the three time periods in their freshmen thru senior years.

We would especially caution against strong conclusions here because of the large number of categories and the consequent breaking up of the sample into just a few students in many of the categories. We would point out, however, an increase in undecided majors during the freshman and sophomore years over the time periods. You will note that the undecided major column disappears in the junior and senior years since everyone had either decided on a major, or left the institution, by then. We were somewhat surprised to see the percentage of math/sc. majors decline over the time periods. Also we were somewhat surprised to see no clear trends in either education or business. We had expected the former to go down and the latter to go up, but both fluctuated over the time periods.

TABLE 1

Educational trend Periods

Early 60's and Before	26	Students
1968-1975	48	Students
1976-1981	48	Students

TABLE 2

Time Units Completed

1-2 sem. or 1-4 qrt.	3-4 sem. or 5-8 qrt.
----------------------	----------------------

11 (9%)

19 (16%)

5-8 sem. or 9-16 qrt.	No response
-----------------------	-------------

78 (64%)

1 (1%)

MORE THAN 8 SEM. OR 16 QTR.

13 (10%)

TABLE 3

	Fr.	So.	Jr.	Sr.
Professional Adviser	38%	22%	8%	8%
Departmental Adviser	39%	48%	65%	60%

TABLE 4

Obliged to consult an adviser

Fr.	So.	Jr.	Sr.
66%	55%	48%	45%

TABLE 5

Students received help in deciding major

Self	Teacher	Parents/Family	Others
39%	21%	14%	12%
Friends	Professional Adviser		
3%	3%		

TABLE 6

Students' ratings of their Academic Advisement

Excellent to Good

49%

Fair to Poor

50%

TABLE 7

Institutions (N=58)

Public
34

Private
24

Central Advisement (N=22)

Public
12

Private
10

TABLE 8

Central Advising Staff Size

1-3	4-6	7-10	more than 10
38%	24%	10%	29%

TABLE 9

Institutions having evaluation procedures

Yes

12 (21%)

No

46 (79%)

TABLE 10

GRADYR
BY ADVRTG

COUNT		ADVRTG				ROW TOTAL
ROW PCT	EXTOGD	FRTOPR				
COL PCT						
TOT PCT						
		1		2		
GRADYR						
	1	15	10	25		
BFR68		60.0	40.0	20.7		
		25.0	16.4			
		12.4	8.3			
	2	25	23	48		
68T075		52.1	47.9	39.7		
		41.7	37.7			
		20.7	19.0			
	3	20	28	48		
75T081		41.7	58.3	39.7		
		33.3	45.9			
		16.5	23.1			
COLUMN		60	61	121		
TOTAL		49.6	50.4	100.0		

TABLE 11

GRADYR
BY PUBPRI

COUNT		PUBPRI		ROW TOTAL
ROW	PCT	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	
COL	PCT			
TOT	PCT	1	2	
GRADYR				
8FR68	1	15	11	26
		57.7	42.3	21.3
		18.8	26.2	
		12.3	9.0	
68T075	2	29	19	48
		60.4	39.6	39.3
		36.2	45.2	
		23.8	15.6	
76T081	3	36	12	48
		75.0	25.0	39.3
		45.0	26.6	
		29.5	9.8	
COLUMN		80	42	122
TOTAL		65.6	34.4	100.0

TABLE 12

~~PURPRI~~
~~BY ADVRTG~~

		COUNT		ADVRTG		FRTOPR	ROW TOTAL
ROW	PCT	PCT	I	EXT	OGD		
COL	PCT	PCT	I				
TOT PCT		I	1	I	2	I	
PURPRI		I		I		I	
1		I	36	I	44	I	80
PUBLIC		I	45.0	I	55.0	I	66.1
		I	60.0	I	72.1	I	
		I	25.8	I	36.4	I	
2		I		I		I	
PRIVATE		I	24	I	17	I	41
		I	58.5	I	41.5	I	33.9
		I	40.0	I	27.9	I	
		I	19.8	I	14.0	I	
COLUMN			60		61		121
TOTAL			49.6		50.4		100.0

TABLE 13

PUBPRI RY ADVRTG						
CONTROLLING FOR.. GRADYR						
VALUE 1 BPR68						

ADVRTG						
COUNT	1	EXTOGD		FRTOPR		ROW
ROW PCT	1					TOTAL
COL PCT	1					
TOT PCT	1	1	1	2	1	
PUBPRI	1	10	1	5	1	15
PUBLIC	1	66.7	1	33.3	1	60.0
	1	66.7	1	50.0	1	
	1	40.0	1	20.0	1	
	1	-----	1	-----	1	
PRIVATE	2	5	1	5	1	10
	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	40.0
	1	33.3	1	50.0	1	
	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	
	1	-----	1	-----	1	
COLUMN	15	10		25		
TOTAL	60.0	40.0		100.0		

TABLE 14

R

PURPRI BY ADVRTG					
CONTROLLING FOR..					
GRADYR					
VALUE 2 681075					

ADVRTG					
COUNT	ROW PCT	TEXTUGD	FRTOPR	ROW	
COL PCT	TOT PCT	1	2	TOTAL	
PURPRI					
PUBLIC	1	15	14	29	
		51.7	48.3	60.4	
		60.0	60.9		
		31.3	29.2		
PRIVATE	2	10	9	19	
		52.6	47.4	39.6	
		40.0	39.1		
		20.8	18.8		
COLUMN		25	23	48	
TOTAL		52.1	47.9	100.0	

TABLE 15

PURPRI						
BY ADVRTG						
CONTROLLING FOR..						
GRADYR						
VALUE			3	76T081		

ADVRTG						
COUNT	I	EXTOD		FRTOPR		ROW
ROW PCT	I	I		I		TOTAL
COL PCT	I	I		I		
TOT PCT	I	1	I	2	I	
PURPRI	---	---	---	---	---	---
1	I	11	I	25	I	36
PUBLIC	I	30.6	I	69.4	I	75.0
	I	55.0	I	89.3	I	
	I	22.9	I	52.1	I	
	---	---	---	---	---	---
2	I	9	I	3	I	12
PRIVATE	I	75.0	I	25.0	I	25.0
	I	45.0	I	10.7	I	
	I	18.8	I	6.3	I	
	---	---	---	---	---	---
COLUMN		20		28		48
TOTAL		41.7		58.3		100.0

TABLE 16

INSTYP BY ADVRTG				

ADVRTG				
COUNT	EXT	OGD	FRTOPR	ROW
ROW PCT	TOTAL		TOTAL	
COL PCT	TOTAL		TOTAL	
TOT PCT	TOTAL		TOTAL	
INSTYP	TOTAL		TOTAL	
1	5	13	18	
MULTUNIV	27.8	72.2	14.9	
	8.3	21.3		
	4.1	10.7		
	TOTAL		TOTAL	
2	30	31	61	
PUBUNIV	49.2	50.8	50.4	
	50.0	50.8		
	24.8	25.6		
	TOTAL		TOTAL	
3	25	17	42	
PRIUNIV	59.5	40.5	34.7	
	41.7	27.9		
	20.7	14.0		
	TOTAL		TOTAL	
COLUMN	60	61	121	
TOTAL	49.6	50.4	100.0	

TABLE 17

CENTADV BY ADVRTG						

ADVRTG						
COUNT	ROW PCT	TEXT	TOGD	FRT	OPR	ROW TOTAL
COL PCT	TOT PCT	1		2		
CENTADV						
YES	1	I	27	I	21	48
		I	56.3	I	43.8	42.9
		I	47.4	I	38.2	
		I	24.1	I	18.8	
-----I-----						
NO	2	I	30	I	34	64
		I	46.9	I	53.1	57.1
-----I-----						
		I	52.6	I	61.8	I
		I	26.8	I	30.4	I
-----I-----						
COLUMN TOTAL			57		55	112
			50.9		49.1	100.0

TABLE 18

GRADYR
BY FRMAJ

FRMAJ												
COUNT	ROW PCT	COL PCT	TOT PCT	UNDEC	MATHSCT	SOCSCCT	EDUC	NURSHLT	HUMAN	BUSN	ROW TOTAL	
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
GRADYR	1			3	7	2	4	1	5	1	23	
AFR68				13.0	30.4	8.7	17.4	4.3	21.7	4.3	20.0	
				13.6	30.4	15.4	21.1	16.7	25.0	8.3		
				2.6	6.1	1.7	3.5	.9	4.3	.9		
68T075	2			8	10	4	2	3	6	7	47	
				17.0	21.3	8.5	19.1	6.4	12.8	14.2	40.9	
				36.4	43.9	30.6	47.4	50.0	30.0	58.3		
				7.0	8.7	3.5	7.8	2.6	5.2	6.1		
78T081	3			11	6	7	6	2	9	4	45	
				24.4	13.5	15.6	13.3	4.4	20.0	8.9	39.1	
				50.0	26.1	53.8	31.6	33.3	45.0	33.3		
				9.6	5.2	6.1	5.2	1.7	7.8	3.5		
COLUMN TOTAL				22	23	13	19	6	20	12	115	
				19.1	20.0	11.3	16.5	5.2	17.4	10.4	100.0	

TABLE 19

GRADYR RY SOMAJ										

SOMAJ										
COUNT	ROW PCT	UNDEC	MATHSCT	SOCSCI	EDUC	NURSHLT	HUMAN	RUSN	ROW TOTAL	
COL PCT	TOT PCT									
GRADYR	1	0	19.0	14.3	28.6	4.8	23.8	9.5	21	18.8
RFR68	1	0	22.2	18.8	27.3	14.3	25.0	11.1		
	1	0	3.6	2.7	5.4	.9	4.5	1.8		
88T075	2	2	19.1	14.9	19.1	10.6	12.8	19.1	47	42.0
	1	18.2	50.0	43.8	40.9	71.4	30.0	50.0		
	1	1.8	8.0	6.3	8.0	4.5	5.4	8.0		
76T081	3	9	11.4	13.6	15.9	2.3	20.5	15.9	44	39.3
	1	20.5	27.8	37.5	31.8	14.3	45.0	58.9		
	1	8.0	4.5	5.4	6.3	.9	8.0	6.3		
COLUMN TOTAL		11	18	16	22	7	20	18	112	
		9.8	16.1	14.3	19.6	6.3	17.9	16.1	100.0	

TABLE 20

GRADYR BY JRMAJ										

JRMAJ										
COUNT	I	MATHSCT	SOCSCCT	EDUC	NURSHIT	HUMAN	BUSN	ROW		TOTAL
ROW PCT	I									
COL PCT	I									
TOT PCT	I	2	3	4	5	6	7			
GRADYR	1	4	3	8	1	3	2			21
REFR68	1	19.0	14.3	38.1	4.8	14.3	9.5			20.4
	1	26.7	16.7	30.8	12.5	13.0	15.4			
	1	3.9	2.9	7.8	1.0	2.9	1.9			
	2	7	7	8	6	9	7			44
68T075	1	15.9	15.9	18.2	13.6	20.3	15.9			42.7
	1	46.7	36.9	30.8	75.0	39.1	53.8			
	1	6.8	6.8	7.8	5.8	8.7	6.8			
	3	4	6	10	1	11	4			38
76T081	1	10.5	21.1	26.3	2.6	28.9	10.5			36.9
	1	26.7	40.4	38.5	12.5	47.8	38.8			
	1	3.9	7.8	9.7	1.0	10.7	3.9			
COLUMN		15	18	26	8	23	13			103
TOTAL		14.6	17.5	25.2	7.8	22.3	12.6			100.0

TABLE 21

GRADYR BY SRMAJ									

		SRMAJ							
COUNT	ROW PCT	MATHSCI	SOCSCI	EDUC	NURSHLT	HUMAN	BUSN	ROW TOTAL	
COL PCT	TOT PCT								
GRADYR	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	1	4	3	8	1	3	2		21
8PR68		19.0	14.3	38.1	4.8	14.3	9.5		21.6
		30.8	16.7	30.8	12.5	15.0	16.7		
		4.1	3.1	8.2	1.0	3.1	2.1		
	2	7	7	6	6	7	6		41
68T075		17.1	17.1	19.5	14.6	17.1	14.6		42.3
		53.8	38.9	30.8	75.0	35.0	50.0		
		7.2	7.2	8.2	6.2	7.2	6.2		
	3	2	8	10	1	10	4		35
76T081		5.7	22.9	28.6	2.9	28.6	11.4		36.1
		15.4	44.4	38.5	12.5	50.0	33.3		
		2.1	8.2	10.3	1.0	10.3	8.1		
COLUMN TOTAL		13	18	26	8	20	12		97
		13.4	18.6	26.8	8.2	20.6	12.4		100.0

REFERENCES

- Aitken, Caroline E. and Clifton Conrad, "Improving Academic Advising Through Computerization," College and University; 53; 1; 115-23 F77 (EJ172046)
- Bonifacio, Philip, Joan Nolan, "Computer-Augmented Counseling; Maintaining Student Services on a Limited Budget," Journal of College Student Personnel; V19 N5 p. 398-401 Sep 1978 (EJ190057)
- Capoor, Madan, "A study of the Academic Advisement System in a Community College", Air Forum 1979 15 p.; paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (19th, San Diego, California, May 13-17, 1979) (ED174070)
- Collins, Dwane R. and Myrtle T. Collins, "The Counseling of Minority Group Student ", Counseling and Values; 18; 3; 199-204 74 (EJ097650)
- Crookston, Burns B., "A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching," Journal of College Student Personnel; 13; 1; 12-17 Jan. 72 (EJ050061)
- Dameron, Joseph D. and John C. Wolf, "Academic Advisement in Higher Education: A New Model," Journal of College Student Personnel; 15; 6; 170-473 Nov. 74 (EJ107205)
- Fedo, David A. and others, "Should Students be Advised Against Majoring in Areas of Study Where Job Prospects are Weak?", Change; 10; 6; 66-8, Jun-July 78 (EJ181863)
- Gibson, Gordon, "A Meta-Presentation of a Theoretical and Research Base for Academic Advisement." 9p.; Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention (San Diego, CA, Feb. 9-12, 1973) (ED085621)
- Gordon, Virginia and others, "A Comprehensive Program of Academic Advising and Career Development for University Freshmen," 16p.; paper presented at the annual convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Washington, D.C., March 19-23, 1978. (ED162216)
- Grites, Thomas J., "Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties", AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Reports, No. 7, 1979. (ED178023)
- Higbee, Mona T., "Student Advisement Centers: A Timely Idea," Improving College and University Teaching; V27 N1 P47-48 Win 1979 (EJ201643)
- Johnson, Craig W. and James Pinkney, "Outreach: Counseling Services Impacts on Faculty Advising of Students," Journal of College Student Personnel; V21 N1 P80-84 Jan 1980 (EJ217261)
- Kapraun, E. Daniel and Doris Coldren, "Academic Advisement: An Integrated Approach," 13p. 78 (ED172841)

- Kurlander, Edwin D., "Attitudes Toward College--A Counseling Priority," New York State Personnel and Guidance Journal; 9; 1; 33-36 74 (EJ095876)
- Mahoney, John and others, "The Relationship of Faculty Experience and Advisee Load to Perceptions of Academic Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel, 19; 1; 28-32 Jan 78 (EJ175395)
- Mash, Donald J., "Academic Advising: Too Often Taken for Granted," College Board Review; 107; 33-6 SPR 78 (EJ179416)
- Meskill, Victor P. and Wesley Sheffield, "A New Speciality: Full Time Academic Counselors," Personnel Guidance J; 49; 1; 55-58 Sep 70 (EJ024013)
- Metz, Joseph, "Academic Advisement: Personnel and Preparation," 11p.; paper presented at Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Chicago, Ill., April 11-14, 1976) (ED133631)
- O'Banion, Terry, "An Academic Advising Model," Junior College Journal; 42; 6; 62, 64, 66-69 Mar 72 (EJ051520)
- Polson, Cheryl Jean, Anthony Jurich, "The Departmental Academic Advising Center: An Alternative to Faculty Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel: V20 N3 P249-53 May 1979 (EJ200847)
- Ravekes, John E., "Development and Evaluation of Essex Community College's Revised Academic Advising System," NASPA Journal; 9; 1; 237-241 Apr71 (EJ034631)
- "Report on Counseling Evaluation Guidelines Developed by the Ad Hoc Counseling Task Force and Endorsed by the Illinois Community College BOA," 21p. 26 Jan 79 (ED167 229)
- Sheffield, Wesley and Victor Meskill, "Faculty Adviser and Academic Counselor: A Pragmatic Marriage," Journal of College Student Personnel; 13; 1; 28-30, Jan 72 (EJ049992)
- Shelton, Joe B., "A Comparison of Faculty Academic Advising and Academic Advising by Professional Counselors. Final Report" 77p, Feb. 72 (ED065088)
- Switzer, Luci, "Student Counseling Services: ISU Strips Away the Superstructure," College and University Business; 54; 3; 41-43 Mar 73 (EJ071036)
- Upcraft, M. Lee, "Undergraduate Students as Academic Advisers", Personnel and Guidance Journal; 49; 10; 827-831 Jun 71 (EJ037572)
- White, Rudolph and others, "Facilitating Advising Through a Computerized Checklist," College and University; 53; 2; 164-71 W78 (EJ185082)
- Witters, Lee A. and Harry G. Miller, "College Advising: An Analysis of Advisor Advisee Roles," Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education; 9; 2; 36-40 win 71 (EJ034188)
- Young, Peter L., "Academic Guidance: A Brief Comment on the State of the Art in Tertiary Institutions," Australian University; 14; 1; 58-64 May 76 (EJ157174)

STUDENT
Questionnaire

1. Name of College/University attended _____
Location _____
(If you attended more than one please use a separate questionnaire for each.)
2. Type of Institution:
_____ a. Multiversity (Over 25,000) _____ d. Private College
_____ b. Public University (Under 25,000) _____ e. Church-Related College
_____ c. Private University (Under 25,000) _____ f. Public College
3. Number of semesters _____ OR Number of quarters _____ Yrs. 19__ to 19__
4. Did you enter the College/University with:
(circle one) an undecided major a decided major
5. What was your major as a
a. Freshman _____
b. Sophomore _____
c. Junior _____
d. Senior _____
6. (Answer 1. full-time Academic Counselor, 2. Dept. Professor, or 3. other (describe), to the following question)
Who helped you plan your courses as a
a. Freshman _____
b. Sophomore _____
c. Junior _____
d. Senior _____
7. Was all academic advisement for freshmen done in one central office at your College/University? Yes _____ No _____
8. Were you obliged by the Administration to consult with an advisor before registering for courses each semester or quarter while at the College/University as a (check)
a. Freshman Yes _____ No _____
b. Sophomore Yes _____ No _____
c. Junior Yes _____ No _____
d. Senior Yes _____ No _____
9. Were you assigned an academic advisor in the Department of your major?
Yes _____ No _____
10. If yes (No.8) what year? (circle one) Fresh. Soph. Junior Senior
11. If no (No.8) who helped you decide what courses to take for your major? (circle one) Friends Parents Self Other _____
12. Who would you say was most influential in helping you decide what major you would pursue in College/University? _____
13. How would you rate the academic advising you received at this College/University? (circle one) Excellent Good Fair Poor
14. If you would like to comment on what you would consider to be an ideal advisement program for College/University students, please do so on the back of this paper.

SELECTED RESPONSES TO STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 14

(Describe An Ideal Advisement Program)

1976-81

"An ideal advisement program could include several mandatory meetings with an adviser or professor every year. Most students entering college aren't really sure what they want to study and need help in this area. I needed to be 'talked to' and forced to think about what I really wanted out of college, and no one did that for me. The student is assigned an academic adviser in the student's major and the student meets with him/her usually only once or twice a semester to okay courses for the next sem. Other meetings are up to the student to arrange, and I don't think too many freshmen are self-assured enough to do that. (But then again, I guess that's what college is for!) I realize time is definely a factor, especially at large Univ. but a good advising program seems worth it. It might cut down the number of majors being changed and credit hours being inapplicable toward one's major. I would have preferred a more active advising program and I think many students would agree."

"The ideal program would combine a four yr. counseling program with some sort of mid-semester exposure to future classes. A student should get exposure to a specific class before actually enrolling for the class. Many professors will not let students observe in their class, so maybe an organized program by the guidance dept. could assist students in this area."

"The advisers I have had were quite young and seemed unable to identify with the 'older' student. In other words, they found it difficult to believe someone would attend the university to gain an education primarily and not to attain a 'marketable' skill. As one coily stated, 'these philosophy and history courses won't help you get a job when you need it'. I realize that most young people have neither the time, money nor inclination to do what I'm doing but advisers should be aware that there are people alive who enjoy learning and are not driven to it to gain credit hrs. and/or future employment."

"Ideally, departmental advisers should be full-time advisers. Since this is not practical, the advisers for upper division students with a specific major should be chosen from professors who want the job. The professors that I have had for advisers haven't had the least interest in the job."

"It has been my experience that dept. professors are lacking in counseling skills necessary to assist students seeking help in academic programs. Further, professors acting as academic advisers are completely ignorant of program requirements listed in catalogs. Therefore, the problem that arises is a professor's acceptance of certain courses which are nullified by the dept. or Univ. I would suggest maintaining a full-time advising office in each department, staffed by qualified counselors familiar with academic requirements and who have the authority to grant credit for courses taken within the dept. Should problems arise between the student and the professor, the academic adviser could act as an ombudsman to resolve the dispute. Professors, who are already burdened with teaching, research, and administration functions should not be allowed to perform a critical service for which they are not qualified."

"Implore each and every student to follow Socrates' dictum, 'know thyself'. A pint of Wild Turkey and a free afternoon on a windy beach or an overcast ridgetop might be suggested. This will do wonders to ease the burden on counselors! I would then suggest regular meetings before each sem/quarter with a departmental adviser who is familiar with the student's work or at least has access to his/her file. Given the constraint of time and budget I believe this is what a student at any institution has the right to expect."

1968-75

"I don't think there is any such thing as an 'ideal' advisement program. Most faculty advisers are not very good at advising (that's why they're teachers!). I think that any intelligent student with a college catalog can make decisions for themselves. Advisement (and I mean competent advisement) should be available for those who are confused or have some questions. I think this should be handled by professional advisers who are familiar with all requirements for all majors and minors. Perhaps if I had a good adviser I might have chosen a minor area that would have made my major more marketable. These are the kinds of things advisers should be doing."

Early 1960's

"Although I rate the advice I received as 'poor' I am compelled to add that I cannot imagine any advising program I would not rate as 'poor'. The ideal advisement program would be no advisement program. No student should be compelled to meet with, much less, follow the advice of any adviser."

INSTITUTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return to:

Jo Barger, Academic Advisor
Academic Assistance Center
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

1. Name of College/University

Location _____
City State

2. Type of Institution (check one)

- _____ a. Multiuniversity (Over 25,000) _____ d. Private College
_____ b. Public University (Under 25,000) _____ e. Church related College
_____ c. Private University (Under 25,000) _____ f. Public College

3. Is your College/University on semester ____ or quarter ____ system (check one)

4. Who is responsible for the academic advisement of

Freshmen _____
Sophomores _____
Juniors _____
Seniors _____

(Answer a. Professional Academic Advisors, b. Faculty Advisors, c. Other - explain)

5. Are students obliged to consult with an advisor before pre-registering for courses each semester/quarter? (check yes or no for each year)

Freshmen	Yes _____	No _____
Sophomores	Yes _____	No _____
Juniors	Yes _____	No _____
Seniors	Yes _____	No _____

6. Who at your institution is assigned the responsibility for helping students make a decision concerning a major if the student enters your College/University undecided? _____

7. Do you have a centralized academic advisement center at your College/University?

_____ If yes, how large is the staff? _____
Yes No

8. Is there an evaluation procedure for the academic advisement program at your College/University? _____

Yes No

If yes, please describe briefly.

Number of Student Questionnaires sent.....206
returned.....122

Number of Institution Questionnaires sent..... 79
returned..... 58

Names of Institutions represented in this study
(returned questionnaires):

1. Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind. 47306
2. Barry College, Miami Shores, Florida 33161
3. Brescia College, Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
4. Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio 44106
5. Catawba College, Salisbury, N.C. 28144
6. Central Michigan Univ., Mount Pleasant, Mich. 48859
7. College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn. 55105
8. Davidson College, Davidson, No. Carolina 28036
9. DePauw Univ., Greencastle, Ind. 46135
10. Eastern Ill. Univ., Charleston, Ill. 61920
11. Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Fla. 32307
12. Florida Atlantic Univ., Boca Raton, Fla. 33432
13. Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Fla. 32901
14. Glenville State College, Glenville, W. Virginia 26351
15. Hamilton College, Clinton, New York 13323
16. Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. 02138
17. Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind. 47401
18. Ind. Univ.-Purdue Univ. at Fort Wayne, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46805
19. Ind. Univ.-Purdue Univ. at Indianapolis, Indianapolis, Ind. 46202
20. Kent State Univ., Kent, Ohio 44240
21. Miami Univ. of Ohio, Oxford, Ohio 45056
22. Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, Mich. 48824
23. Mississippi State Univ., Miss. State, Miss. 39762
24. Nazareth College, Nazareth, Michigan 49074
25. North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh, No. Carolina 27607
26. Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Ill. 60201
27. Notre Dame Univ., Notre Dame, Ind. 46556
28. Paine College, Augusta, Ga. 30901
29. Prairie View College, Prairie View, Texas 77445
30. Queens College, Charlotte, N.C. 28207
31. St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46808
32. St. Louis Univ., St. Louis, Missouri 63103
33. St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556
34. Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga. 31404
35. Southern University, Baton Rouge, La. 70813
36. Texas Southern Univ., Houston, Texas 77004
37. Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
38. University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio 45469
39. University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich. 48221
40. University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77004
41. Univ. of Ill. at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Ill. 61801
42. Univ. of Ill. at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Ill. 60680
43. Univ. of Ill. at the Medical Center, Chicago, Ill. 60680

44. University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242
45. University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla. 33124
47. University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
48. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex. 87131
49. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. Carolina 27514
50. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 22903
51. University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 98195
52. Univ. of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, Wisc. 54481
53. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wy. 82071
54. Villanova, Villanova, Pa. 19085
55. Wake Forest Univ., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27109
56. Western Ill. Univ., McComb, Ill. 61455
57. Western New Mexico, Silver City, New Mex. 88061
58. Wiley College, Marshall, Texas 75670